DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 139 HE 009 677

AUTHOR White, Richard N.
TITLE The Organization of Tasks and The Social Organization of Students at Two Graduate Schools of Business.
INSTITUTION Chicago Univ., Ill.; De Paul Univ., Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Behavioral Science Research; *Business Education; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Norms; *Organizational Effectiveness; Social Values; Student Behavior; Student College Relationship; *Task Analysis

ABSTRACT

The concepts of the goals and perspectives of organizations and the organization of tasks, which have been valuable in the analysis of industrial work settings, were used to analyze two graduate schools of business that differ on these dimensions. The schools examined were the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business and the Northwestern University Graduate School of Management. Distinct patterns of academic and social norms and behavior were found to emerge among the students at these schools. Results of the research indicate that the different organizational perspectives and goals held by the two schools studied are associated with distinctive organizations of tasks and that these are, in turn, associated with the formation of characteristic academic and social norms and behavior. It was found that the fit between the goals and the task organization appears to be good in each of the schools studied, a measure of organizational success. The academic and social norms and behavior that were observed support the argument that the distinctive task of organization of these two schools is associated with the formation of characteristic academic and social norms and behavior. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AERA SESSION 14.16

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE CE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED152139

THE ORGANIZATION OF TASKS AND THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF STUDENTS AT TWO GRADUATE SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Richard N. White

PhD Candidate - Univ rsity of Chicago
Lecturer - DePaul University

April, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard N. White
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

I am indebted to Charles E. Bidwell, Robert Dreeben, Dan C. Lortie and Steven T. Bossert for helpful comments throughout the course of this research.

Not for quotation without permission

HE006927

Sociological studies of industrial and bureaucratic work settings have shown that the organization of tasks within a setting has important consequences for the other elements of the social organization of that setting. It has also been argued in previous research that the goals and perspectives of an organization may greatly influence the choice a particular task organization when this choice is not predetermined by available technology. Educational settings are work settings for students, teachers and administrators and an analysis of their work place in terms of the organization of tasks, an investigation into the choice of particular task organizations, and and evaluation of the resulting socialization outcomes seems appropriate. The research reported here investigates the relationship of the organization of tasks to the academic and social norms and behavior which emerge among students in two graduate schools of business, the relationship between the goals and perspectives of these two schools and their task organizations, and an examination of the "fit" between the organizational goals and the social organization of their students.

The term "organization of tasks" refers to the constraints and facilities to which participants in a setting are exposed (Reeves, et. al., 1970). Examples of constraints found in industrial settings include such things as the rules and regulations, tightness of control, the system of payment and the pace of work. Facilities are "opportunities for behavior within an organization which is neither required nor precluded by constraints" such as the opportunity for workers to interact informally (Reeves, et.al, p.9). Examples of the constraints

and facilities present in the organization of tasks of the schools studied include the extent of student choice over courses and associates, the amount of student collaboration allowed on assignments, the evaluation of students as groups or as individuals, and the encouragement of activities resulting in informal student interaction.

Academic and social norms refer to private and collective expressions of the way in which things ought to be done and interpretations of the way in which things are done in these areas of student life. Behavior refers to the manner in which a person acts as a result of

> the administrative and technological constraints to which he is subject in his job...everything a person has to do or chooses to do within the discretionary limitations of his job... and behavior engaged in in order to take advantage of the various amenities, facilities and opportunities that membership of an organization offers. (Reeves, et. al., p.10-11)

This includes behavior which exceeds normal expectations and which fails to meet them.

Organizational perspectives and goals are used here to include the organization's conception of its raw material, its preferred methods of operating, its product goals and to desired changes in prestige and domain (Perrow, 1970; Thompson, 1967).

In their work in industrial settings, Reeves, et. al. (1970) have argued that theories about these settings are incomplete if they do not consider the interactions between the social and technical aspects of the organizations. The model produced from these studies recognizes the potential influence of the organization

of tasks and the sources of norms, values and informal rules within work groups and consequences of these for the individual. Empirical studies of work settings by sociologists point out the fruitfulness of this approach and suggest potential salient characteristics of the organization of tasks for other elements of the social organization of a setting. Blau (1955), Crompton and Wedderburn (1970), Homans (1950), Kerr and Siegal (1954), Roy (1952), Sayles (1958), and Seashore (1954) have identified such variables as doing identical tasks, working side by side, work group size, worker discretion in pace of work, method of evaluation, method of compensation, freedom of physical movement, and the possibility of social interaction as being related to the pattern of social interaction, the existance/of group standards for production, the likelihood of collective action such as going out on strike, the amount of competition and helping behavior among workers, adherence to group productivity norms, and attitudes toward supervisors and the company.

Breer and Locke (1965) have formulated a theory which relates the task performed in a situation to changes in beliefs, preferences and values. Their theory, simply stated, is that if a person finds performing a task in a certain manner rewarding, he comes to prefer and value that manner of performing the task and to believe that it is the best way. Breer and Locke theorize that a belief, value and preference for a way to do things will generalize laterally to similar tasks and vertically to become a general way to approach any task. They have completed a number

of laboratory experiments and obtained results which support their hypotheses.

Cartwright and Zander (1953, 1960) have reviewed other experimental studies which point to specific elements of task organization which affect other parts of the social organization of a setting. One of these is the cohesiveness of a group. A list of factors which affect group cohesiveness includes: a commonality of fate in terms of evaluation and reward, the difficulty of the task for individual members, the status of the group relative to other groups, the amount of interaction permitted among members, and the size of the group. Another element of the social organization of a group which has been studied in the laboratory is the development and enforcement of group standards. Cohesiveness has been found to have a part in this process in a number of studies (Cartwright and Zander, 1960; Kelley, 1954; Pepitone, 1960, Riecken, 1954; Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). Elements of the organization of tasks which have been found to directly influence the formation and enforcement of group standards include: the publicness of members' judgements (Deutsch, 1960), formal assignment to a group which cannot easily be changed (Cartwright and Zander, 1953), group centered leadership (Cartwright and Zander, 1953), and the type of task performed and the amount of experience members have had with the task (Borgatta and Bales, 1953).

This literature suggests that the organization of tasks within work settings has important consequences for the social relationships, behavior and attitudes of workers. While it may be argued that students in graduate schools of business have little

similarity to workers in dull, dead-end, repetive and long-term jobs or to participants in short laboratory experiments, the findings in these settings suggest that these concepts may be valuable in the analysis and design of other settings including educational organizations.

The investigation of the reasons for the choice of a particular organization of tasks has also been done primarily in the study of business and industry. Woodward (1965) concluded from a study of commercial firms in England that an organization's mode of production was associated with a characteristic task organization and that this association is especially strong at the extremes of a continuum of technological sophistication. In the middle of this continuum "ideas which express the goals of the work are less closely tied to the technology of manufacturing" (Woodward, 1970, p. xi). The mode of production for these firms does not determine the organization of tasks but only sets limits on the range of alternatives from which managers could choose. Perrow's task analysis approach provides insight into the bases of management choices of the technology for organizations in this middle range (1965). He points out that culture influences the choice of technologies through values and belief systems which determine acceptable goals, the collection of technologies available and the definition of the nature of the raw material worked on (especially important when choosing a technology for a people processing organization). Perrow also feels that the technology chosen influences the structure of an organization, the arrangements necessary to accomplish its goals.

Perrow has also specified several categories of organizational goals (1970). Systems, product and output goals are the most

pertinent to this study and can be seen as refinements of Woodward's term "mode of production." Product goals refer to the characteristics of the goods or services produced such as an emphasis on quality, quantity, variety or uniqueness. Systems goals refer to "the state or manner of functioning of the organization, independent of the goods or services it produces"(p. 135) such as an emphasis on growth or on being tightly structured. Output goals are the types of output the organization produces such as education or buisness services.

Thompson's (1967) description of organizations seeking to control their environment by increasing domain and prestige suggest other considerations for the choice of technologies. An organization's domain is the claim it stakes out for itself in terms of its range of products, the population served and the services rendered. An organization might seek to reinforce its claim to a domain by gaining prestige, the favorable image of the organization among its salient publics.

A further important consideration in the study of organizational goals and structure is the degree of "fit" between these factors. For example, in Woodward's (1965) survey of industrial firms she found that the most successful firms in each category of technology were those near the median on each element of the organization of tasks (such as span of control) for firms using the same mode of production. One of the few studies which has looked at the relationship between organizational goals, the organizations of tasks and the social organization of those in the organization is Street's (1965) study of juvenile inmate groups. He found that institutions with goals varying along a continuum of rehabilitation/

custody had distinct patterns of deprivation and gratification and different patterns of control and authority. The inmates showed different patterns of group formation, leadership and "prisonized" attitudes. Although different in goals, structure and outcomes, Street's "findings indicate tentatively that both custodial and treatment organizations tend to accomplish their proximate goals"(p. 55).

This literature suggests that organizational goals are important factors in the choice of task organization and that the study of the relationship between an organization's goals, task organization and outcomes may reveal a lack of fit between means and goals.

The potential value of the analysis of the organization of tasks to aspects of school effects has been recognized in the discussion or results of some studies. Dreeben (1968) and Parsons (1959) have formulated theoretical arguments stating that since the task organization of schools offers different experiences from those of other socialization settings, different norms and values are learned. Inkeles and Smith (1974) make a similar argument in their discussion of the role of schools in the modernizing of individuals.

Becker, et. al. (1961), in their study of a medical school, obtained results which correspond to these theoretical formulations and which are similar to the findings in industrial settings. The curriculum was found to be the basis of the organization of tasks. First year students attended the same classes, were isolated

from other students and saw a great deal of each other through class attendance, laboratory assignments and housing arrangements. Because of the similarity of experience imposed upon the students by the curriculum, the students' problems were also similar and occurred at the same times. Becker found that the solutions to these problems were determined collectively and that this was made possible and perhaps inevitable by the organization of tasks.

Dreeben (1970) elaborated on these findings in developing his concept of leverage (whether the nature of tasks required of professional students force them ot abandon old attitudes and adopt new ones) and linkage (the connections provided between previous experiences , professional education and subsequent work settings). Dreeben argues that the degree of leverage and linkage in the task structure of a professional school has consequences for the adoption of a professional ethic and for commitment to the occupation, using Becker's study of medical education and the education of teachers as examples.

Bossert (1975) has most directly applied the concept of the organization of tasks to understanding the social organization of educational settings. He investigated the consequences of distinctive types of task organization for the emergence of social relationships, and found that elementary classrooms can be distinguished in terms of dominant task structure and that different task structures are associated with different patterns of pupil-teacher and pupil-pupil interactions.

> For example, in classrooms which predominately used recitation, peer associations were influended by the academic hierarchy that developed among the pupils. After the first few weeks of task activities, friend-

> ship groupings began to form among children who were performing at similar levels (p. 118).
>
> ...Children in the multi-task settings associated with others having similar hobby interests, independent of their respective performance levels (p. 119).

The literature suggests that the organization of tasks is an important component of the school setting and has consequences for the behavior and socialization of those within it. More research in this area is clearly needed.

Even less frequently applied to the study of schools settings are the concepts of organizational goals and perspectives. In a review of administrative theory Griffiths (1969) concluded that, with the exception of Bidwell's (1965) description of the school as a formal organization, "relatively little of a theoretical or research nature has been done on the structure of organizations" (Griffiths, 1969, p. 20). Clark's (1970) study of distinctive colleges in which he uses the terms organizational role, mission and saga to indicate concepts similar to Thompson's use of domain is a more recent exception to Griffith's statement.

Bidwell's (1965) description of the particularism of student-teacher relationships arising out of existing teaching technology and which conflicts with the bureaucratic principles of universalistic standards and testing to assure minimum product quality may be stated in Perrow's terms as a conflict between cultural and technological systems and between system and product goals. This also is an example of the evaluation of the "fit" between goals and task structure. Gross's (1963) description of organizational lag between a university's goals for research, teaching and service and the structure of work for faculty is another example.

The literature suggests that organizational goals and perspectives are an important source of the organization of tasks and that the fit between task organization and goals is important for the success of an organization. The organization of tasks, in turn, has been shown to be an important component of the work setting having consequences for the behavior and learned norms of those within it. Although infrequently applied to the study of education, the organizational goal and organization of task approaches to the analysis of organizations has been shown to be useful in understanding these settings as well. The study reported here seeks to contribute to this literature in several ways. By choosing graduate schools of business as the setting for this research, this study is distinct from those of industrial work settings as it does not involve persons holding dull, repetitive, dead-end jobs. This study differs from Bossert's as it investigates a different level of education and uses the school as the unit of analysis. It differs from Becker's study in that it involves a comparison of two schools with different task organizations. It also involves a profession without the prestige, clarity of mission or normative component of medicine. Nor do business schools have the same workload or aspects of total institution as do medical schools. Finally, this study seeks to add a different type of institution to the few studies which have considered the origins of the structure of tasks in an organization and to add to the even smaller body of studies which investigate the appropriateness of the task organization for the goals of the organization.

The problem for this paper, then, is to: 1) describe the perspectives and goals of these organizations and their relationship

to the organization of tasks chosen; 2) describe the way in which the schools studied differ in their task organizations; 3) describe the academic and social norms associated with the task organization of each school; and 4) describe why different sets of norms and behavior develop in schools characterized by distinctive task organizations.

Methodology

The study is a longitudinal comparison of students at two graduate schools of business. The students recruited to the two schools were similar in ability and background but have been subjected to different patterns of constraints and facilities through curricular and administrative arrangements. Field observations provide a continual record of the experiences of students, their behavior, and their attitudes toward academic and social matters.

The graduate schools of business at The University of Chicago and Northwestern University were selected as research sites. These sites were chosen according to the following criteria:

1. The sites must be professional schools of relatively equal prestige and must train their students for the same profession.
2. The students entering the schools must be of similar academic ability and have similar academic and work experience backgrounds.
3. The size of the student bodies must be similar.
4. The schools must have different task organizations prescribed by their curricula.

A brief description of tne two schools and their students will be presented below.

This research was carried out through participant observation following the constant comparative method outlined by Glaser and Strauss (1967). As this is a new setting to analyze in terms of the concepts of task organization, there was not enough information available in the literature to indicate specific variables and relationships or to permit the formation of hypotheses.

I began this study in September of 1974 during the orientation weeks conducted for new students by each school. The results presented here concern observations made during the first year of the two year programs.

The role I assumed while observing was that of participant-as-observer as defined by Gold (1958). I spent two days per week at each site with students, accompanying them in all phases of their activities including classes, library work, meals, formal and informal social gatherings. I followed different students or groups of students through their entire day. While observing students, I engaged in as many casual conversations as possible. These conversations are a major source of information about the activities and opinions of individuals and descriptions of events I was unable to attend. It was also possible at these times to ask questions about issues that concerned the students and to conduct informal interviews.

This data is supplemented by observations of student behavior such as the conduct in classes or interaction patterns at parties and records of conversations overheard. I have also gathered copies of student newspapers, announcements of activities and items passed out by administrators and placement offices. Field

observations were written as soon after observations as possible, often when sitting in on classes during the day as I found taking notes at other times disturbed the students.

To investigate the organizational perspectives and goals I have conducted interviews with faculty and administrators and others familiar with the history and goals of the two schools. The interviews have focused on descriptions of the organization of student tasks over the history of the school, the rationale behind whatever changes have occured, the goals of the organization for its self and its students and to changes in these over time. I have also studied catalogs and other formal statements of goals and purposes.

The Schools

The students entering the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business and the Northwestern University Graduate School of Management are very similar in their academic backgrounds and abilities as is indicated below.

	University of Chicago	Northwestern University
Undergraduate G.P.A.	3.2	3.2
ATGSB Scores	575	573
% With Fulltime Work Experience	33%	34%
Mean Age	22	22
% Female	15%	18%
% Minority	8%	6%

% Business Undergraduate Degree	18%	16%
% Engineering, Natural Science Undergraduate Degree	28%	24%
Entering Class Size	287	300

Organizational Perspectives and Goals - Northwestern

Perhaps the most prominent feature of Northwestern's perspectives and goals is a recent, major change in domain. In 1970 the faculty of the school of management voted to discontinue the undergraduate portion of the school (which at the time was one of the two or three best schools in the nation), and become a graduate school of management. This meant a major change in each of the three aspects of domain. In addition, it was necessary to promise those in the organization who were opposed to this change that Northwestern would maintain its high level of prestige and continue to be thought of as one of the best schools. One of the ways it has sought to accomplish this is to increase the "range of products" aspect of its domain. It has begun programs training managers for hospital and health administration, public administration, and educational administration in addition to business administration.*

In terms of population served, Northwestern is seeking to enlarge its domain by placing its graduates in successful firms on a wider basis, both geographically and functionally. Like all

---

*It is on this basis that Northwestern is called a school of management rather than a school of business. However, it is interesting to note that other schools, including the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business also have such programs.

educational organizations, Northwestern also serves its students. It is seeking to narrow its population served to only the most able students, but is recruiting from a wider geographical area.

As for services rendered, or in Perrow's terms output goals, Northwestern was primarily a teaching institution with faculty doing consulting work previously. Now it emphasizes primary research by the faculty. A Northwestern "school of marketing theory" has been developed.

Part of the cultural perspective of Northwestern that management is primarily a way of thought and that once given the basic skills and sufficient practise their graduates can approach any problem in any type of organization. They feel that to gain this state of mind the old attitudes of the students must be torn down and new ones erected. It is also felt that a paternal concern for the welfare of students is appropriate. Another aspect of the cultural perspective of Northwestern is the view that its raw material, students, requires standardization before the organization begins to operate on it.

The organizations systems goals emphasize the learning and practicing of the skills of a manager. They also emphasize high structure and growth.

The product goals emphasize high quality and wide applicability of the student's skills. The student's are to be problem solvers who could work anywhere. This goal applies a certain standardization of the finished good. Additional product goals for its graduates is the formation of a class and school identity. In this way graduates enter careers with a web of contacts which are likely to improve their chance of success which will reflect on the school.

The school identity is thought to increase alumni support for the school both in the form of finances and jobs for graduates.

Another approach to prestige is to foster an image of uniqueness for the organization's role. In Clark's terms this is an organizational mission and hopefully will become a saga. In the past Northwestern had been considered as an image of Harvard and had recruited many of their faculty and deans from there. Now it seeks to have a unique image, distinct from Harvard and from Chicago. Several respondents have mentioned that Northwestern has taken the best from both schools and added elements of their own.

Organizational Perspectives and Goals - Chicago

Chicago made its transformation from an undergraduate to a graduate school earlier than Northwestern and seems well settled into a domain and organizational role. It might be said to have established an organizational saga, borrowed in part from the institution of which it is a part. Chicago seems to be seeking to continue to function as it has, while seeking higher quality students and faculty, but it has held its position among the top five schools of business for some time.

In its components of domain it is quite similar to Northwestern. The school offers the same range of products, serves much the same population in terms of organizations to which it supplies managers and the students which it recruits, although on a wider geographical basis; and, its services rendered emphasize primary research by faculty, consulting and teaching to a lesser degree.

The cultural perspective of Chicago also regards the manager as a problem solver with skills applicable to any situation but feels that practice, or trying to simulate business experience is a waste of time and is best left to employers. The emphasize that managers should be able to continue to learn, rather than be trained in specific skills which would soon be ortmoded. Thus they feel a thorrough grounding in the basic disciplines is the proper approach. Chicago feels business is a science which should be studied like any other. Chicago does not conceive of their students as needing standardization and they feel a laissez-faire approach to the quality of student life is appropriate.

Chicago's system goals emphasize low structure, a community of scholars and the de-emphasis of simulated business experience.

Product goals include high quality graduates who can work anywhere and who can be flexible in their careers, adjusting to new types of firms and to new developments inknowledge and business conditions.

From these perspectives and goals one might predict that the two schools will have choosen technologies, or task organizations, which are different. Northwestern can be expected to have mechanisms for standardizing their students, changing attitudes, practicing skills learned and that there will be great involvement in the lives of students. At Chicago one might predict little involvement in student lives, encouragement in research and theory and an emphasis on basic disciplines.

The Organization of Tasks at Northwestern

The distinctive character of task organization at Northwestern begins during orientation week. Before their arrival students are assigned to one of six sections, a group of about 50 students. For orientation week the sections are further subdivided into "companies" which compete in a computer simulated business game. The volume, complexity and sohpistication of the data given for decision making overwhelmed many students. One remarked that he felt the game was only played to show the students how little they know, a reaction which would support the argument that this is an unfreezing process similar to that described by Schein (1960).

Orientation activities began before nine and ended at five each day. In addition several evenings were used for game decision periods and for informal gatherings with faculty, held by section. Nearly all of the students' waking hours were spent at school performing activities as part of a section. There was little opportunity to meet other first year or second year students. At a party held for all students at the end of this week nearly all interaction took place within the boundaries of section membership.

The centrality of the sections in the organization of tasks at Northwestern continued during the first quarter of classes. Section members took all of there classes together, seperately from all other sections. Homework assignments frequently involved group work such as presentations to the class or the preparation of papers for which all group members would receive the same grade. Students were encouraged to form discussion groups for the preparation of cases and for individual papers. These group assignments cause a large amount of a student's non-class time to be spent in school related

activities with other section members.

Each section was given money by the school to provide social activities exclusively for their members and the faculty members from each section's courses were encouraged to attend.

Each students schedule consisted of four courses that met twice a week for 100 minutes per class. No classes met on Wednesdays. The classes were assigned to sections so that only two of that section's classes were held each day with a two hour and twenty minute break between classes. Half of the first year students were in class at any given time. This schedule required the students to be on campus for at least six hours, four days a week. Many students were required to spend even more time in courses during the first quarter. Students who were not proficient with the computer (the majority of the students) were required to take an additional course, by section, in computer programming which met on the afternoon of the otherwise free day.

During the second and third quarters of the academic year studied, the sections no longer existed as a formal part of the task organizations. Although certain courses were required in this quarter by the curriculum, the students were free to take whatever professor and whatever offering of the courses they desired. The characteristic group homework assignments remained prevalent and the workload high. Preparations for and the conduct of interviews for summer jobs more than filled the time freed by the end of the computer course.

The Organization of Tasks at Chicago.

The orientation week at the University of Chicago was also

representative of its overall task organization. There was no division of students into sections or companies. The students were brought together for one presentation by members of the administration and student government on the first day. After this brief meeting, the students were divided into small groups for a short talk with a second year student who described activities and student life at the school and answered questions about courses and professors.

The remainder of orientation week was spent at each student's discretion. There was a computer game played on two afternoons but it was simpler than the Northwestern game, participation was voluntary and only a fifth of the students became involved. Few students spent an entire day on campus. Once registered, the average student spent his time settling into his living quarters and exploring the area.

When registering, students had a wide range of courses to choose from each quarter including the first, and could take the courses from any of the professors offering them. Specific courses were required for graduation but students could take them in any order and any time before graduation. Most courses were offered several times each quarter and during more than one quarter each year. The only restricitons on student choices were that some elementary courses were prerequisites for more advanced courses and that certain professors were considered best to have for particular courses. If one is unable to get a "good" professor and does not need the course as a prerequisite for courses planned for the next quarter, the student waits for another term to take it. As an additional option, the students may take courses

in the evening branch of the school which meets in downtown Chicago. Students are also permitted to enroll in courses in other departments of the university. As a result, students do not take all of their courses with the same group of their fellow students and there are more opportunities for first and second year students to interact.

The students may take three or four courses (twenty are required over six quarters for the degree). Students may also attend during the summer which would normally be spent working. Some students begin working on their degrees in quarters other than the fall. Classes meet for one hour and twenty minutes twice a week. Students arrange different schedules for themselves, some prefering early morning classes, some prefering all of their classes in the afternoons, some on the same two days, etc.

Courses involve little or no group work. Most are lectures in format and require individual homework assignments and exams or term papers.

Because there is no formal organization of the students into sections, there are no parallels for the section budgets or parties. There were no school wide parties until the end of the third quarter.

Like Northwestern, living arrangements were up to the students. The majority lived in private apartments off campus. There was a small dormitory reserved for business students. Approximately 40 first year and 30 second year students lived there.

There was little variation from the task organization of the first quarter, described above, in subsequent quarters.

As described, the two schools studied differ in their organization of tasks for students. On the whole, the first year at Northwestern might be characterized as highly structured, while Chicago might be described as loosely structured. The areas in which the schools are most different are; the degree of student choice over courses and associates, the existence of formal subdivisions of the class, the amount of student collaboration allowed and encouraged on assignments, the evaluation of students by groups or as individuals, the nature and frequency of activities involving informal student interaction, the degree of similarity in courses, timing, situation and problems among all students in the class, the subjection to an unfreezing experience, and the amount of time the student is involved in school activities.

The description of Northwestern resembles the description of other educational settings where notable socialization effects were found. Like the medical school studied by Becker, students within sections attend the same classes, are isolated from other students by the time required in section activities, see a great deal of the other section members, have identical experiences and can easily make interpersonal comparisons (Bidwell, 1972). With these similarities known, one might predict that similar collective coping with the problems of the environment might ensue. Chicago has fewer of these characteristics as students are taking different courses with different students and in different sequences. Problems are experienced individually; one would not predict a collective solution to the problems faced.

As Dreeben's concept of leverage is based in part on the findings of Becker, the Northwestern task organization might be expected to generate pressures problematic for each student and calling for an adaptive solution and provide the "social resources for students to develop a workable collective solution ... in a situation that moderates competitiveness" (Dreeben, 1970, p. 137). Chicago's task organization may also generate such pressures but it might be predicted that the task organization does not provide the resources which would facilitate the development of collective solutions. As in Sayles' description of industrial work sites, the task organization of some settings may increase the propensity for collective actions while that of other settings may reduce such tendencies.

The process of generalization as described by Breer and Locke (1965) would support the argument that students who found doing group assignments rewarding (and we might assume that most would as it is required to obtain credit in these courses) would begin to prefer to work in groups on all assignments. A similar argument might be made for prefering social gatherings among section members even when formal constraints on these groups are removed. At Chicago the preferences generalized might be expected to be for working at tasks as individuals and for social gatherins not based on the formal assignment to groups.

The learning mechanisms of exemplification and reward and punishment as described by Inkeles and Smith (1974) would also support the argument that one could expect different norms and behavior among the students at the two schools. The task organizaion

at Northwestern exemplifies group work while at Chicago it exemplifies individual work. A similar argument could be made for the behavior and norms which are rewarded and punished at the two schools.

Academic Norms and Behavior

The most prominant and universal norms and behavior at Northwestern are those that involve groups. Students are expected to share their knowledge with their section and expecially with those students with whom they usually work on group assignments. Such sharing is expected by many even when it violates the regulations of the school such as when exam answers are shared and homework assignments which are supposed to be done individually are copied. Few expressions of competitive attitudes or behavior attitudes or behavior have been observed. The students feel that they are all in "the same boat." They believe that grades are of little importance in the recruiting process and that all will eventually need to obtain help to complete some assignmen .

The groups were observed to set work rates for courses which have group assignments and for courses which they all take together but which assign individual work. Although these work rates are high, those who exceed the number of hours of studying expected and who appear to be exerting too much effort are negatively sanctioned through kidding, social ostracism, exclusion from helping exchanges and through increased demands for social participation. The demands for social participation will be discussed in more detail later.

Norms also exist for participation in group tasks. Each student is expected to carry his weight. This is true even if

the student is taking that particular course pass-fail and needs only the minimum grade. Task groups at times permit some members to contribute less than their share when they are having difficulty with other courses. Students are usually expected to compensate for this by contributing extra effort on future assignments or in other courses where the same group is working together. With the exception of the demands for more social participation, the same sanctions apply to those who do too little work as to those who do too much.

Other widely held student opinions are that the workload is very heavy, so much so that the administration must be trying to change them. Those with military experience compare school to their experiences in boot camp or officer's candidate school. Another opinion is that the pass-fail option, while designed to allow students to venture into courses they would not take otherwise, is to be used to reduce the workload by being applied either to one's most difficult course or to the one felt to be the poorest because of the professor or the irrelevency of the material covered.

After the first quarter students are free to chose courses they desire. Many of these decisions are made within the groups of friends that have emerged from the work groups of the first quarter. Instead of asking those who might have some insight as to the relative value and quality of courses and professors, such as second year students or faculty, the students asked their fellow group members and came to collective decisions. On the average task group members were together for three of the four courses

in the second quarter. During the third quarter they took fewer courses together and sought more outside information when choosing courses.

At Chicago there were no norms for group academic behavior. Help was given with homework or understanding new concepts but observations of this behavior were less frequent. There were no expectations of helping others on exams or allowing them to copy homework. The students felt that the workload was heavy but manageable. They also felt that most assignments were open ended, that one could spend a large amount of time on each assignment beyond the minimum requirement for the course and that they should do so if they found it interesting or predicted it would be useful in the future. Students felt they were competing only with themselves, seeing how much they could learn. There was little notice of how much time individual students spent studying or in the library so there was no social pressure to conform to work rates. An exception to this is found among the students living in the business student dormitory. Here a student's behavior was more visible and there was some kidding about the amount of time some students spent in the library but there was no social exclusion or refusal to help these students. After the beginning of the second quarter a diversification in approach to academic matters was observed. Two major approaches were noted and these correspond to the academic and collegiate subcultures described by Clark and Trow (1966).

Social Norms and Behavior

At Northwestern the section memberships form a firm boundary for friendship formation which lasts long after the formal structure has ended. During the long periods of time spent together during orientation week most of the teams also became friendship groups. This shared, stressful experience provided a common bond that overrode personality conflicts of diversification of experiences later in the curriculum. During the first quarter all members of a section took courses together. This provided ample opportunity to learn names and faces and to strike up conversations and friendships. This process was aided by the use of nameplates and conscious effort on the part of faculty to mention a student's name each time they participated in the class. The layout of most classrooms allowed students to see the nameplates placed in front of each student while seated in class. The social gatherings made possible by the section budgets also aided in this process as did the frequent group assignements. After three or four weeks of classes definite section identities had formed. Students were quick to claim that their section was the friendliest, the smartest, the most cooperative or just the best of all the sections. During the schoolwide parties students interacted almost exclusively with section members. This was also true during time spent in the student lounge, in the library and at meals. Some students felt restrained by the section arrangement and made special efforts to meet and talk with students in other sections, acknowledging the power of section boudaries by doing so.

After a few weeks of classes the sections subdivided into

more intensive friendship groups. These are based on proximity of residence, personalities or the orientation week experience. These groups were almost always formed entirely within the section. Many of the students did not know any students outside of their section. Even those first year students elected to the student government by the class as a whole would remark to me how strange it was not to know a single person in one of the other sections they had to report to on government plans and activities.

The sections were a more powerful basis of friendship than either residential proximity or coming from the same undergraduate school. Six units of a twenty four unit apartment building, for example, are occupied by business students. This building was designed so that all of the units opened onto common balconies and stairwells. Although students from the same section who lived in this building formed friendships among themselves more quickly than they did with section members living in other buildings, they did not even know the names of the business students from other sections who lived there, in several cases next door. Students from the same undergraduate school spent some time together during orientation week but reported rapidly losing contact.

There were some patterned exceptions to the section being the major basis of friendship although the other friendships which arose were usually in addition to those of the section. One group of male students were housed in a dormitory of another college. They were away from Northwestern's campus and dependent on each other for transporation. The were housed on the same floor and had only other business students for roomates. They felt that this was a common bad experience because they had signed

contracts for single rooms and had not been told that they would be required to comply with the paternalistic regulations which this college enforced among undergraduates. Women in the business school were a small minority in each section and the school as a whole and seemed to make friends with women in other sections, as did the black and foreign students. The women also attracted the attention of the second year men and were first to make cross year contacts. Those enrolled in special programs such as hospital administration also made cross section friendships due to the special activities in each program and later the specialized courses offered to program members only.

During the first quarter the intensity of the friendship groups within sections increases, becoming very cliqueish and demanding of their members' time. The members were expected to participate in whatever activities the group or the section held. Group activities became more frequent during this time such as parties on Fridays and drinks after evenings spent in the library. Students reported feelings of guilt when unable to participate and being torn when forced to decide between a group's activities and time needed to master academic matters to the degree the student's personal standards demanded. Married students were especially torn between group and personal demands. Some coped by holding study and social sessions in their homes. Most participated in the academic activities of the group but to a lesser extent in the spontaneous social activities. They reported feeling that they were missing out on some of the benefits to be gained from full group participation.

I have observed and been told of negative sanctions imposed on group

members who failed to participate or were felt to be spending to much time with members of other groups. The sanctions included being eliminated from the academic helping system, temporary ostracism, directly confronting the erring member by asking what he felt was wrong with the group, and, as in sanctioning for academic behavior, increased pressure to have the person attend more of the group's social activities.

Attempts by individuals within groups or by groups themselves to seize positions of leadership were not acceptable. Those who attempted to do so were ostracized from group or section activities, sometimes permanently. They would also be isolated in academic activities and kidded about their presumptions of grandeur. When elections for formal office were held the succussful candidates were those who had the most casual approach to the election and voting seemed to be more against those who had attempted to lead the groups or sections earlier/rather than for any particular candidate.

After the first quarter sections no longer existed formally, but the friendship groupings were not greatly affected. Many had chosen the majority of their classes to be with their friendship groups. When free to chose seats in classes the groups sat together and if a student was taking a different course from his group, he sat with members of his old section. During this time there were more frequent observations and reports of sanctioning to maintain friendship groups, althought they occaisionally expanded to include an exceptionally compatible member who had been in another section. Usually these were the only members of other sections a student would know. In the lounge, library and at meals and at school wide parties most interaction was among section members. This pattern

was maintained during the third quarter.

One consequence of the intensity of interaction within the friendship groups was that there was little privacy for their members, they were expected to account for their time to the rest of the group. Some deliberately provoked ostracism in order to gain a measure of privacy. One activity precluded by this lack of privacy was dating. This was especially true for pairings within group and section boundaries. The full details of any date were demanded and quickly spread throughout the group and section and this was too embarassing for most students. When a student dated ouside the section or outside the school, they were exposed to much of the same treatment. Much of the dating that was done was kept secret, labled as "sneak dating" by the students.

At Chicago there was no parallel section structure to limit friendship formation, nor were shared task experiences provided through orientation or group assignments in classes to serve as a basis for group formation. Those who did participate in the voluntary business game during orientation week did say, however, that one of the major benefits of participation was the opportunity to meet people. For the majority of students first friendships were formed by accidental seating arrangements and casual conversations. Some friendships have emerged on the basis of taking several classes together but most friendships are not based on school experiences alone. Some other bases of group formation at Chicago were having attended the same undergraduate school, residential proximity including living in the business student dormitory, sex, race, nationality and membership in special programs.

Groups were very informal and their membership changed continuously. Unlike Northwestern, there was a mixing of first and second year students in these groups.

Those living in the dormitory developed norms and behavior patterns similar to the sections at Northwestern. Students here spent virtually every waking hour in the company of other students. Groups formed by floors of the dormitory. There was more homework helping and course advice here than was observed among the rest of the students. Some took most of their courses with other dorm residents and sat together in classes. The dorm members also interacted among themselves at social gatherings. The social pressure exerted by these groups was weaker than at Northwestern and the boundaries more permeable. One pattern that was similar was that there was little dating among the first year dormitory residents, while other students dated more frequently than at Northwestern.

There was little pressure for participation, the norm being for individual mixes of academic and social life. There was also little focus on leadership so there was no attempt to keep all students at the same status. Little change in this pattern occurred over time.

Discussion

The results of this research indicate that the different organizational perspectives and goals held by the two schools studied are associated with distinctive organizations of tasks and that these are, in turn, associated with the formation of characteristic academic and social norms and behavior.

Graduate schools of business are not constrained to one

technology in order to produce graduate managers, like firms falling in Woodward's middle range the choice of this output goal only places limits on the task organizations which may be developed. It would seem that business schools could choose any organization of tasks as long as it received accredidation from regulating bodies, continued to attract students, continued to be seen by potential employers as a viable method of training and was seen by the faculty as a legitimate way to train future managers. The remarks of the administrators at Northwestern that they had taken the best part of the task organizations from two successful schools, Chicago and Harvard, indicate that they perceived themselves as being able to make a choice. The contention by Chicago's administrators that Harvard made the wrong choice when designing its school of business by looking to the law school rather than the medical school indicates that they also recognize that there are choices to be made. Dreeben's (1970) description of different forms of professional education and comparison with the education of teachers implies that other choices could be made for the training of teachers. Schein's (1972) proscriptions for professional education of all kinds indicates there are still other task organization elements to choose from and that future demands of society may constrain the choices of technology that any professional school can make.

The organizational perspectives and goals, then, are the primary force behind the choice of the organization of tasks for each school. The fit between the goals and the task organization appears to be good in each of the schools studied, a measure of organizational success. The only indications of bad fit come from looking at the consequences of the task organization on the norms and behavior

of members. At Northwestern an indication that the fit could be better is the incidence of cheating on assignments that are supposed to be done alone. The administration seems suprised by the frequency of cheating and has begun warning students against it. This study indicates that a reduction in the number of group graded assignments might be a more effective way dealing with this problem. At Chicago the only indication of bad fit is the lack of alumni solidarity and support for the school. Administrators recognize that this may be a result of the lack of mechanisms in their task organization that foster class or school identity and say that this "hurts us."

The academic and social norms and behavior which were observed support the argument that the distinctive task organization of these two schools are associated with the formation of characteristic academic and social norms and behavior. The highly structured school was found to expose their students to similar activities at similar times in groups. As in Becker's description of medical schools, this has led to the recognition of common problems and the adoption of common solutions; the cooperation among students and the group standards of behavior. The students are required by school activities to spend a great deal of time together working at group tasks and these formally defined task groups soon became friendship groups, imposing demands of time and homogeneity of behavior and attitude on their members. Through social pressure, the groups impose work rates for both academic and social behavior. A loosely structured task organization was found to result in

individual experiences, the recognition of few common problems and the development of few common solutions. There are few task groups required here, and friendship group formation is based on factors independent of course required group formation. There is less evidence of widely shared norms or group imposed standards of behavior.

A model based on these results is that the objective task organization in schools provides conditions which produce characteristic peer relations, and that the peer relations mediate the impact of the organization of tasks on the other elements of the setting. In this study the different organizations of tasks are associated with different academic and social norms and behavior. It is hypothesized that the combined effect of the objective task structure and peer relations result in different exposures to learning mechanisms and different contents to be learned.

The findings of this research has implications for both educational administrators and for sociologists. For administrators it has shown that an analysis of this type is a potentialy valuable evaluation of the success of an organization in reaching its goals. That it can point out sources of conflict and problems in the operation of an organization that might otherwise go unrecognized, and like the problem with cheating at Northwestern may suggest solutions. The study also has implications for resource allocation within an organization of the salient task elements for the desired outcomes, such as alumni support, can be established. An analysis of this type can indicate unanticipated consequences of changes in domain or other administrative decisions for students and suggests research that would indicate long term effects.

It may also be argued that the results of this study have implications for the understanding and predicition of the long term effect of exposure to particular task organizations in schools. Because patterned relationships between the organization of tasks and the academic and social norms and behavior were found, and because of the nature of these norms and behavior, one might expect that some relationship with vocational norms and behavior will emerge among the students studied. An argument can be made that at Northwestern, with its highly structured task organization, the groups which impose standards of academic and social activity might also be able to influence a student's attitudes toward jobs and careers. For example, peers might be expected to be a significant influence on career decisions and that within groups and sections vocational aspirations would be homogeneous. It might also be hypothesized that Northwestern graduates would be more likely to choose and remain in jobs in which they would be part of a group in a highly structured setting involving group work. A corresponding argument might be made for students at Chicago. Peer influences might be expected to be less significant in career decisions and these decisions more heterogeneous as was the case in academic and social matters. The graduates might also be expected to choose and remain in jobs where they would be working as individuals on seperate tasks.

Support for this argument is present in the statements made by students seeking accounting careers in the larger national accounting firms. Apparently some of these firms are organized so that each professional employee is treated as an individual specialist and that different combinations of specialists were

assigned to each jobs. Other firms assemble "teams" which remain intact from job to job. A student at Chicago stated that he was only considering the firms in which he would be an individual as this would give him the maximum opportunity to develop and demonstrate his ability and that it would give him a chance to meet more people within the firm. A student at Northwestern preferred the firms with the team approach because he felt he would be better able to learn from the more senior people by prolonged exposure to them and that this would enable them to more accurately assess his abilities.

Summary

The concepts of the goals and perspectives of organizations and the organization of tasks, which have been valuable in the analysis of industrial work settings, have been used to analyze two graduate schools of business which differ on these dimensions. Distinct patterns of academic and social norms and behavior were found to emerge among the students at these schools. It has been argued that these findings have implications for the analysis and design of educational settings and for understanding long-term educational effects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, Howard S.; Geer, Blanche; Hughes, Everett C.; and Strauss, Anselm. Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bidwell, Charles E. The School as a Formal Organization. In James G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1965.

_____, Schooling and Socialization for Moral Commitment. Interchange, 1972, 3, 1-27.

Blau, Peter M. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Borgatta, Edgar F., and Bales, Robert F. Task and Accumulation of Experience as Factors in the Interaction of Small Groups. Sociometry. 1953, 16, 239-257.

Bossert, Steven T. "Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1975.

Breer, Paul E., and Locke, Edwin A. Task Experience as a Source of Attitudes. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1965.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin. (eds.) Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1953.

_____. Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. 2nd ed. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1960.

Clark, Burton R. The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

_____, and Trow, Martin. The Organizational Context. In T.M. Newcomb and E.K. Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Crompton, Rosemary, and Wedderburn, Dorothy. Technological Constraints and Workers' Attitudes. in Joan Woodward (ed.), Industrial Organization: Behaviour and Control. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Deutsch, Morton, and Gerard, Harold, A Study of Normative and Informational Social Influences upon Individual Judgement. In Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (eds.). Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1960.

Dreeben, Robert. On What is Learned in School. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

_____. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970.

Glaser, Barney G., and Strauss, Anselm. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Griffiths, Daniel E. Administrative Theory. in Robert L. Ebel (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th edition, Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1969.

Gross, Neal. Organizational Lag in American Universities. Harvard Educational Review, 1963, 33, 58-73.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950.

Inkeles, Alex and Smith, David H. Becoming Modern: Individual Change in Six Developing Countries. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Kelley, Harold H., and Thibaut, John W., Experimental Studies of Group Problem Solving and Process. In Lindzey, George (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Kerr, Clark, and Siegel, Abraham. The Interindustry Propensity to Strike - an International Comparison. In Arthur Kornhauser, et. al. (eds.), Industrial Conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Parsons, Talcott. The School Class as a Social System: Some of its functions in American Society. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 297-318.

Pepitone, Albert, and Reichling, George. Group Cohesiveness and the Expression of Hostility. In Cartwright, Dorwin and Zander, Alvin (eds.). Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1960.

Perrow, Charles. Hospitals: Technology, Structure, and Goals. In March, James G. (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

_____. Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1970.

Reeves, Tom Kynaston; Turner, Barry A.; and Woodward, Joan. Technology and Organizational Behavior. In Woodward, Joan (ed.), Industrial Organization: Behaviour and Control. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Riecken, Henry W. and Homans, George C. Psychological Aspects of Social Structure. In Lindzey, George (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Roy, Donald. Quota Restriction and Goldbricking in a Machine Shop. American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 57, 427-442.

Sayles, Leonard R. Behavior of Industrial Work Groups: Prediction and Control. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Schein, Edgar H. Interpersonal Communication, Group Solidarity and Social Influence. Sociometry, 1960, 23, 148-161.

_____, and Kommers, Dianne W., Professional Education: Some New Directions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Seashore, Stanley E. Group Cohesiveness in the Industrial Work Group. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1954.

Street, David. The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings. American Sociological Review, 1965, 40-55.

Thibaut, John W. and Kelley, Harold H. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Woodward, Joan (ed.) Industrial Organization: Behaviour and Conrol. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

_____, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practise. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.